UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,039	12/07/2000	Scott A. Moskowitz	031838.0008	1226

45702 7590 09/30/2004

SCOTT A. MOSKOWITZ
16711 COLLINS AVENUE #2505
SUNNY ISLES BEACH, FL 33160

EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN, BRANDON S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2136	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/731,039	MOSKOWITZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brandon Hoffman	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 September 2004* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-68* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-68* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on *07 June 2004* is: a)☒ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-68 are pending in this office action.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-68 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the signal quality levels" in line 18. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the predetermined signal quality level" in line 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Rejections

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. Claims 1-8, 12-20, 60, 62, 63, 66-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirose (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,915).

Regarding claims 1 and 66, Hirose teaches a method/system for securing a data object, comprising:

- Providing a data object comprising digital data and file format information (col. 4, lines 51-55 and col. 5, lines 4-13);
- Embedding independent data into the data object (fig. 3, ref. num 12); and
- Scrambling the data object to degrade the data object to a predetermined signal quality level (fig. 2, ref. num 27 and col. 5, lines 14-34).

Regarding claims 2 and 5, Hirose teaches the step of performing the steps of embedding and scrambling until a predetermined condition is met (col. 5, lines 14-23).

Regarding claims 3 and 6, Hirose teaches the predetermined condition comprises reaching a desired signal quality level of the data object (col. 5, lines 35-39).

Regarding claims 4 and 67, Hirose teaches the steps of:

- Descrambling the data object to upgrade the data object to a predetermined signal quality level (fig. 6, ref. num 31 and col. 9, lines 29-42); and
- Decoding the embedded independent data (col. 9, lines 21-27).

Regarding claim 7, Hirose teaches the predetermined signal quality level is selected from the group consisting of telephone quality, radio quality, MP3 quality, and CD quality (col. 5, lines 14-34).

Regarding claim 8, Hirose teaches the predetermined signal quality level is selected from the group consisting of NTSC quality, QuickTime quality, Macrovision quality, satellite quality, high definition quality, and DVD quality (col. 5, lines 14-34).

Regarding claim 12, Hirose teaches the data object comprises at least one of digital music, video, and at least one image (fig. 3, VIDEO and AUDIO SIGNAL).

Regarding claim 13, Hirose teaches the step of scrambling the independent data before the embedding step so that the embedding step embeds the scrambled independent data into the data object (fig. 3, ref. num 11 comes before 12).

Regarding claims 14 and 68, Hirose teaches a method/system for distributing a data signal, comprising:

- Providing a data signal comprising digital data and file format information (col. 4, lines 51-55 and col. 5, lines 4-13)
- Selecting a first scrambling technique to apply to the data signal (col. 5, lines 14-24);
- Scrambling the data signal using the first scrambling technique, resulting in a first-level degraded data signal (col. 5, lines 14-24); and

- Creating a first descrambling key for the first-level degraded data signal based on the first scrambling technique (col. 5, lines 39-41);
- Selecting a second scrambling technique to apply to the first-level degraded data signal (col. 5, lines 52-62);
- Scrambling the first-level degraded data signal using a second scrambling technique, resulting in a second-level degraded data signal (col. 5, lines 52-62); and
- Creating a second descrambling key for the second-level degraded data signal based on the second scrambling technique (col. 9, lines 8-13).

Regarding claim 15, Hirose teaches associating a first payment level with the data signal; associating a second payment level with the first-level degraded data signal; and associating a third payment level with the second-level degraded data signal (col. 11, lines 9-12).

Regarding claim 16, Hirose teaches selecting a payment level; and applying at least one of the descrambling keys to the second-level degraded data signal, resulting the associated data signal (col. 11, lines 13-37).

Regarding claim 17, Hirose teaches at least one of the first scrambling technique and the second scrambling technique comprises manipulation of the file format information (col. 5, lines 47-51).

Regarding claim 18, Hirose teaches at least one of the first scrambling technique and the second scrambling technique comprises a cryptographic cipher (fig. 3, ref. num 11).

Regarding claim 19, Hirose teaches the signal quality levels are selected from the group consisting of CD quality, MP3 quality, radio quality, and telephone quality (col. 5, lines 14-34).

Regarding claim 20, Hirose teaches the predetermined signal quality level is selected from the group consisting of NTSC quality, QuickTime quality, Macrovision quality, satellite quality, and DVD quality (col. 5, lines 14-34).

Regarding claim 60, Hirose teaches a method for bandwidth allocation, comprising:

- Presenting a plurality of data objects to a user, each data object having a security application (col. 4, lines 51-55 and col. 5, lines 4-13);
- Linking at least a first data object to at least one second data object (fig. 8);
- Wherein a characteristic of the first data object causes a change in the second data object (col. 11, lines 13-37).

Regarding claim 62, Hirose teaches an increased quantity of the first data object causes a signal quality level of the second data object to increase (col. 11, lines 13-37).

Regarding claim 63, Hirose teaches a signal quality level of the second data object is increased with a predetermined key (col. 11, lines 13-37).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 9-11, 21-23, 27-42, 44, 48, 49, 51-59, 64, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirose (USPN '713) in view of Wasilewski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,474).

Regarding claim 9, Hirose teaches all the limitations of claim 1 above. However, Hirose does not teach the independent data comprises authenticatable data.

Wasilewski et al. teaches the independent data comprises authenticatable data (col. 9, lines 23-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the independent data comprising authenticatable data, as taught by Wasilewski et al., to the method of Hirose. It would have been obvious for such modifications because some form of copy protection would be desirable in a system where data is transmitted over a communications medium.

Regarding claim 10, the Examiner takes Official Notice that a robust open watermark would be an obvious choice for authenticatable data. Watermarking is very common in the

communication of data; by using a watermark that is open, it is easy to be seen by any person wishing to access the data – therefore informing the person upfront of the copy prevention wanting to be obtained; by using a watermark that is robust, the person will find it very difficult to remove the watermarking feature if the person were to choose to cheat the copyright holder. The combination of a robust open watermark provides an easy to acknowledge, but very difficult to break, method of protecting copy written data.

Regarding claim 11, Hirose teaches all the limitations of claims 1 and 4 above. However, Hirose does not teach wherein the step of decoding the embedded independent data comprises using a public key to decode the independent data.

Wasilewski et al. wherein the step of decoding the embedded independent data comprises using a public key to decode the independent data (col. 8, lines 6-7). Although this shows encoding using a public key, it would have been as easy to encode with a private key, thereby decoding with a public key.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the step of decoding the independent data comprises using a public key, as taught by Wasilewski et al., with the method of Hirose. It would have been obvious for such modifications because some form of copy protection would be desirable in a communications system. By using a public key to decode the data, a corresponding private

key would encode the data, thereby creating a public key cryptographic system to provide security of data over transmission.

Regarding claim 21, Hirose teaches a method for distributing a data object, comprising:

- Providing a data object comprising digital data and file format information (col. 4, lines 51-55 and col. 5, lines 4-13); and
- Manipulating the file format information based on at least one signal characteristic of the data object (col. 5, lines 58-65).

Hirose does not teach encoding independent authentication data into the data object.

Wasilewski et al. teaches encoding independent authentication data into the data object (col. 9, lines 23-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine encoding independent authentication data into the data object, as taught by Wasilewski et al., to the method of Hirose. It would have been obvious for such modifications because some form of copy protection would be desirable in a system were data is transmitted over a communications medium. Authenticatable data would provide the means of determining if the data is a legitimate version of the original.

Regarding claim 22, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the independent authentication data is steganographically encoded into the data object (see col. 9, lines 30-46 of Wasilewski et al., the MAC is appended to the encrypted control word, which is used to compare with the hashed value of the encrypted control word and the multi-session key. The MAC is sent unencrypted, i.e., in the clear, and therefore would stand to reason as being steganographically encoded into the entire data object).

Regarding claim 23, the Examiner takes Official Notice that a robust open watermark would be an obvious choice for authenticatable data. Watermarking is very common in the communication of data; by using a watermark that is open, it is easy to be seen by any person wishing to access the data – therefore informing the person upfront of the copy prevention wanting to be obtained; by using a watermark that is robust, the person will find it very difficult to remove the watermarking feature if the person were to choose to cheat the copyright holder. The combination of a robust open watermark provides an easy to acknowledge, but very difficult to break, method of protecting copy written data.

Regarding claims 27 and 28, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the steps of encoding independent authentication data into the data object and manipulating the file format information based on at least one signal characteristic of the data object comprise multiple step encoding and manipulation (see fig. 3A of Wasilewski et al.), and an order of the multiple steps is ciphered to generate a predetermined key (see fig. 3, ref. num 152 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches generating at least one cryptographic key having a logical relationship with the manipulation of the file format information and the steganographic encoding method (see col. 22, lines 53-57 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 30, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches:

- Generating an authorization key that is dependent on a public key and a private key (see fig. 3B, ref. num 1022 and SP PRIVATE KEY of Wasilewski et al.),
- Wherein the authorization key is further dependent on at least one of a time, a channel, and an object (see col. 11, lines 34-50 of Wasilewski et al., a signed message is know to have time stamp information included in it).

Regarding claim 31, Hirose teaches a method for distributing data signals, comprising:

- Embedding independent data into a data object (fig. 3, ref. num 12);
- Scrambling the data object (fig. 3, ref. num 14);
- Distributing the scrambled data object (fig. 3, ref. num 18-21); and
- Descrambling the scrambled data object (fig. 5, ref. num 87).

Hirose does not teach distributing at least one predetermined key that enables access to the data object and descrambling with the predetermined key.

Wasilewski et al. teaches distributing at least one predetermined key that enables access to the data object (fig. 3, ref. num 400) and descrambling with the predetermined key (col. 22, lines 49-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine distributing at least one predetermined key that enables access to the data object and descrambling with the predetermined key, as taught by Wasilewski et al., to the method of Hirose. It would have been obvious for such modifications because key based cryptography provides a secure means of transmitting data to only the intended recipient.

Regarding claim 32, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the independent data comprises payment information (see fig. 3, CONTRACT CONTENT of Hirose).

Regarding claim 33, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the independent data comprises authentication information (see col. 9, lines 23-29 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 34, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the independent data comprises a one-way hash (see col. 9, lines 35-40 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 35, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the independent data comprises a digital signature (see fig. 3, ref. num 300 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 36, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the independent data comprises a time stamp (see col. 14, lines 48-51 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claims 37 and 38, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the steps of embedding independent data into a data object and scrambling the data object each has a logical relationship with the generation of the predetermined key and a communications channel for which the data signal is being prepared (see col. 22, lines 53-57 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 39, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the step of descrambling the scrambled data object comprises:

- Initiating the transmission of a recipient public key from an intended recipient of the data object to a sender of the data object (see fig. 3B, ref. num 1022 of Wasilewski et al.); and
- Initiating the transmission of a sender session key from the sender to the recipient to initiate descrambling of the embedded independent data (see fig. 3, ref. num 30 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 40, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the step of descrambling the scrambled data object comprises:

- Initiating a session key-based exchange between a sender and receiver (see fig. 3, ref. num 30 of Wasilewski et al.);
- Wherein the session key is dependent on at least one of a channel, a time, and a data object (see col. 11, lines 34-50 of Wasilewski et al., a signed message is know to have time stamp information included in it).

Regarding claim 41, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the step of descrambling the scrambled data object comprises initiating a session key-based exchange between a sender and a receiver that is a timing based timing mechanism (see fig. 3, ref. num 30 and 152 of Wasilewski et al., the MUX is time based multiplexing).

Regarding claim 42, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the step of descrambling the scrambled data object comprises initiating a pooling of similar session keys (see fig. 3, ref. num 30 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 44, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the step of descrambling the scrambled data object comprises logically associating a signal quality with a bandwidth allocation model (see col. 5, lines 59-62 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 48, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the step of scrambling the data object comprises scrambling the data object with a cryptographic cipher (see fig. 3, ref. num 154 of Wasilewski et al.).

Regarding claim 49, Hirose teaches a method for data signal distribution, comprising:

- Embedding independent data into the data signal (fig. 3, ref. num 12);
- Applying a scrambling technique selected from the group consisting of file format manipulation and partial encryption (fig. 2, ref. num 27 and col. 5, lines 14-34); and
- Generating a predetermined key (col. 5, lines 16-20).

Hirose does not teach applying a steganographic technique for embedding.

Wasilewski et al. teaches applying a steganographic technique for embedding (col. 9, lines 23-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine applying a steganographic technique for embedding, as taught by Wasilewski et al., with the method of Hirose. It would have been obvious for such modifications because some form of copy protection/authentication would be desirable in a system where data is transmitted over a communications medium.

Regarding claim 51, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the partial encryption scrambling technique is unrelated to any characteristic of the data signal (see col. 11, lines 13-33 of Hirose).

Regarding claim 52, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the partial encryption scrambling technique degrades a signal quality of the data signal (see fig. 7B of Hirose).

Regarding claim 53, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the predetermined key enables descrambling of the signal (see col. 9, lines 29-42 of Hirose).

Regarding claim 54, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the predetermined key is based on unique identifying information for a receiver (see fig. 3, RECEIVING APPARATUS ID of Hirose).

Regarding claims 55 and 56, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the predetermined key is based on a signal quality threshold that is adjustable in at least one of a time, a frequency, a bit depth, and a measure of payment that may be adjusted for at least one of a time, a frequency, and a bit depth (the Examiner takes Official Notice, for example, if the content was a video or image (instead of newspaper), the time/frequency or bit depth would be low for a free subscription, but would increase as the subscription price increased).

Regarding claim 57, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the predetermined key is pre-generated based on at least one expected characteristic of the data signal (see col. 5, lines 35-39).

Regarding claim 58, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the predetermined key is divisible into a plurality of discrete partial keys, each discrete partial key representing less than an entire payment for the data signal (see col. 11, lines 9-12 of Hirose).

Regarding claim 59, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches the predetermined key can be broken into a plurality of discrete partial keys, each discrete partial key representing less than an entire descrambled state for the data signal (see col. 11, lines 13-37 of Hirose).

Regarding claim 64, Hirose teaches all the limitations of claims 60 and 63, above. However, Hirose does not teach the predetermined key comprises at least one session key.

Wasilewski et al. teaches the predetermined key comprises at least one session key (col. 8, lines 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the predetermined key comprises at least one session key, as taught

by Wasilewski et al., to the method of Hirose. It would have been obvious for such modifications because a session key changes with each session, therefore providing more security.

Regarding claim 65, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches at least one session key adjusts a payment for the second data object (see col. 11, lines 9-12 of Hirose).

Claims 24-26, 43, 45-47, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirose (USPN '713) in view of Wasilewski et al. ('474), and further in view of Allen (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,713).

Regarding claims 24-26, 43/45-47, and 50, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. teaches all the limitations of claims 21, 31, and 49, respectively, above. However, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. does not teach the limitations of the following claims.

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. and Allen teaches at least one signal characteristic of the data object comprises file format information (see col. 14, lines 14-30 of Allen).

Regarding claims 25 and 26, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. and Allen teaches the step of generating at least one cryptographic key based on a result of the manipulation of the file format information comprises:

- Selecting at least one of a plurality of signal characteristics of the data format (see col. 5, lines 58-65 of Allen); and
- Ciphering the results of the order of steps of signal characteristic selection (see fig. 3, ref. num 152 of Wasilewski et al.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine at least one signal characteristic of the data object comprises file format information and selecting at least one of a plurality of signal characteristics of the data format, as taught by Allen, with the method of Hirose/Wasilewski et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because scrambling the file format easily prohibits some viewing applications from viewing the data.

Regarding claim 43, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. and Allen teaches the step of descrambling the scrambled data object comprises logically associating a signal quality with a predetermined estimation of a bandwidth requirement for the session (see col. 5, lines 59-62 of Allen).

Regarding claim 45, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. and Allen teaches the step of descrambling the scrambled data object comprises logically associating a signal quality with a signal quality parameter (see col. 3, lines 43-53 of Allen).

Regarding claim 46, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. and Allen teaches the step of descrambling the scrambled data object comprises updating a signal quality of the data object based on an approval of the session keys by the originating data signal server (see col. 6, line 61 through col. 7, line 5 of Allen).

Regarding claim 47, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. and Allen teaches the step of scrambling the data object comprises manipulating file format information of the data object (see col. 5, lines 58-65 of Allen).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine logically associating signal quality with a predetermined estimation of bandwidth or with a signal quality parameter, updating a signal quality of the data object based on approval of the session keys by the originating data signal server, and manipulating file format information of the data object, as taught by Allen, with the method of Hirose/Wasilewski et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because scrambling the file format easily prohibits some viewing applications from viewing the data.

Regarding claim 50, the combination of Hirose in view of Wasilewski et al. and Allen teaches the file format manipulation scrambling technique has a relationship with at least one signal characteristic of the data signal (see col. 5, lines 58-65 of Allen, audio files are encrypted differently than a video file).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the file format manipulation scrambling technique has a relationship with at least one signal characteristic of the data signal, as taught by Allen, with the method of Hirose/Wasilewski et al. It would have been obvious for such modifications because scrambling the file format easily prohibits some viewing applications from viewing the data.

Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirose (USPN '713) in view of Allen (U.S. Patent No. '713).

Regarding claim 61, Hirose teaches all the limitations of claim 60 above. However, Hirose does not teach the first data object comprises advertising.

Allen teaches the first data object comprises advertising (col. 14, lines 31-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the first data object comprises advertising, as taught by Allen, with the method of Hirose. It would have been obvious for such modifications because advertising

allows additional revenue to be paid to the provider of the services, thereby enabling the provider of services to lower costs.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 703-305-4662. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00. However, my new number will be 571-272-3863 after our October 25 move.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon Hoffman

BH

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100